

REMARKS

Claims 6-12 are now in the application. By this Amendment, claim 6 has been amended to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter, but not to limit the claim scope. No new matter has been added.

Claims 6-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the claim feature of a “variation in the pitch of an end portion of a corresponding end turn bearing against said at least one support is negative or zero,” is considered indefinite.

Claim 6 has been amended to recite a variation in the pitch of an end portion of a corresponding end turn bearing against said at least one support is negative, to even more clearly recite the claimed subject matter. Further, Applicant notes that a skilled artisan would be appraised of the claim scope of the specification. As set forth in Fig. 4, and in the accompanying description at page 3, lines 7-11, a negative variation in pitch results in a spring having a spire as depicted by the right end 20a of the spring, whereas a constant pitch results in a spire as depicted at the left end of that spring. In other words, a spring in accordance with claim 6 having a negative pitch variation at one end extends less along its main axis than a spring having a constant pitch.

Claims 6-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 313,896 to Negithon in view of US Patent 6,883,790 to Bottene et al.

Negithon is directed to a casing for a helical spring attached to a longitudinal support. As such, Negithon suggests a helical spring with a constant pitch, as known from the related art discussed in Applicant’s disclosure. However, as depicted, for example, in Fig. 6 of Negithon, this citation fails to suggest features that can reasonably be considered to correspond to the above quoted features of claim 6.

Bottene fails to cure the deficiencies of Negithon discussed above. Bottene is directed to a spring designed to offset a lateral force experienced by a strut. As set forth at col. 2, line 45, the

spring suggested in Bottene is a helical spring. Further, Bottene suggests a spring in which, in an uncompressed state, one end of the spring angles away in one direction and the other end angles away in the opposite direction, relative to the centerline defined by the spring in the compressed state. However, Bottene fails to suggest features that can reasonably be considered to correspond to a negative variation of pitch of an end turn is negative, as recited in claim 6.

In addition, Bottene fails to suggest features that can reasonably be considered to correspond to a support that is constrained to move along a trajectory that is curved, as positively recited in claim 6. Instead, Bottene suggests a strut which oscillates along axis 20 depicted in Fig. 1. Such an linear movement cannot reasonably be considered to correspond to a trajectory that is curved. Accordingly, Bottene fails to suggest the features that the Office Action attributed to this citation.

Claims 7-12 are in condition for allowance for at least their respective dependence on an allowable claim 6, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 22193-00025-US1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Georg M. Hasselmann/
Georg M. Hasselmann

Registration No.: 62,324
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1875 Eye Street, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant